

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1-3 and 5, cancels claims 4 and 6 and adds new claims 7-17. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-3, 5 and 7-17.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to the Abstract of the disclosure as not conforming with the requirements of MPEP §608.01(b). Various amendments were made throughout the Abstract to bring it into conformity with the requirements of MPEP §608.01(b). Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 3-6 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Nishizawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,598); and claim 2 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being Nishizawa in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,125,304). As indicated above, claims 4 and 6 were canceled. Therefore, these rejections with respect to claims 4 and 6 are rendered moot. These rejections with respect to the remaining claims 1-3 and 5 are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited in claims 1-3 and 5 are not taught or suggested by Nishizawa or Suzuki whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Amendments were made to the claims so as to clarify the features of the present invention. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to clarify that the present invention provides a method and apparatus for transforming data formats between different database systems including a host computer and a disk storage

device for storing data. According to the present invention, a skeleton program is provided in the host computer for instructing data format transformation and a first communication program is provided in the host computer for communication with the disk storage device. Also, according to the present invention a data format transformation program for executing data format transformation is provided in the disk storage device and a second communication program for communication with the host computer is also provided in the disk storage device.

Further, according to the present invention a request is sent from the skeleton program to the data transformation program on the disk storage device via the first communication program at the time of data format transformation. The data format transformation program receives the request via the second communication program and transforms data having a format which is used for an application executed on one database system into data having another data format which is used for an application executed on another database system. Thus, according to the present invention the disk storage device stores the data having the another data format in the disk storage device itself.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record, particularly Nishizawa and Suzuki, whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Nishizawa merely discloses a magnetic disk apparatus in which data is converted by a data conversion program based on the receiving of a data request from a client computer. As taught by the Nishizawa the conversion program

performs a conversion so that one type of format data is generated in accordance with the function of the data conversion program. Nishizawa specifically teaches the conversion of data from the DBMS format to the XML document format. Thus, Nishizawa is merely concerned with converting data stored on a disk storage device between a format usable by an application program running on the host computer. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Nishizawa of a method and apparatus for transforming data between different database system formats on a disk storage device itself as in the present invention.

Thus, as is quite clear from above, the present invention provides a method and apparatus which can transform data having a data format of a first DBMS to data having a format of another DBMS in the disk storage device itself. The Examiner's attention is directed to the teachings of the present invention, for example, as illustrated in Fig. 11, wherein data having a DBMS data format 1 is transformed into data having a DBMS data format 2 in the disk storage device itself thereby reducing the system load on the host computers. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Nishizawa.

Therefore, Nishizawa fails to teach or suggest transforming, by the data format conversion program, data having a data format which is used for an application executed on one database system into data having another data format which is used for an application executed on another database system and storing, by the disk storage device, the data having the another data format within the disk storage device, said data format for said one database system being different from said data format of said another database system as recited in the claims.

As is quite clear from the above, the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Nishizawa. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above noted rejection of claims 1, 3 and 5 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Nishizawa is respectfully requested.

The above noted deficiencies of Nishizawa are not supplied by any of the other references of record particularly Suzuki. Therefore, the combination of Nishizawa and any of the other references of record particularly Suzuki still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Suzuki merely teaches the setting of information including a conversion source file, a conversion file name, a board size etc., before data conversion process. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Suzuki of the above described features of the present invention regarding the transforming of data format between different data formats of different database systems as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Therefore, even if Nishizawa is combined with Suzuki, the combination still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 2 as being unpatentable over Nishizawa in view of Suzuki is respectfully requested.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new claims 7-17. New claims 7-17 recite many of the same features shown above not to be taught or

suggested by any of the references of record particularly Nishizawa and Suzuki. Therefore, the same arguments presented above with respect to claims 1-3 and 5 relative to Nishizawa and Suzuki apply as well to new claims 7-17.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-6.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5 and 7-17 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-3, 5 and 7-17 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (520.39598X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 312-6600